



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We may, however, make most advantageous use of the equation (2) by assigning arbitrary forms to the functions ϕ and ψ contained in it, and so construct soluble forms *ad libitum*.

When the equation (1) wants the term involving Dy , we have

$$\phi + \psi = 0 \text{ and } \phi\psi + \psi' = B.$$

Hence $-\phi^2 - \phi' = B.$ (4)

Now, as the second term of the equation (1) can always be banished by a change of the dependent variable, we have arrived at the remarkable result that the solution of the general linear differential equation of the second order depends upon that of the equation (4), whose form is particular and unchanging: and this result is practically important; for if we tabulate the values of $\phi^2 + \phi'$ for all values of ϕ , we should have the solutions themselves of linear differential equations of the second order tabulated at the same time.

By interchanging the symbols x and D in the preceding formulæ, according to the method pointed out by Dr. Hargreave, we are led to a series of general and interesting results.

Dr. Todd made some remarks on the fresco painting in the Abbey of Knockmoy, in the county Galway, of which a fac-simile copy, the exact size of the original, was exhibited in the Antiquarian Court of the Dublin Exhibition.

The public are indebted for the preservation and exhibition of this ancient monument of Irish art to the zeal of Dr. John Lentaigne, at whose instance, and by whose personal exertions, the fac-simile was obtained for the Committee of the Exhibition. The following account of the manner in which the inscriptions were deciphered is given in a letter dated 13th June, 1853, addressed to Dr. Todd by Mr. Eugene Curry:

“John Lentaigne, Esq., on the part of the Committee of the Great Industrial Exhibition, having done me the honour to request me to accompany him to the ruins of the once

noble Abbey of *Cnoc m-Buaidh*, now Knockmoy, in the County of Galway, I proceeded there with him, accompanied by my son, Henry B. Curry, on Saturday evening, 11th [of June] instant. Having reached Athenree in due time, and rested for the night, we proceeded, on Sunday morning, yesterday, to the Abbey, where we arrived after a smart drive of about two hours. We found the inscription in a very hopeless state of decay, having suffered almost total extinction in several places, only three perfect words remaining on the lower line. I examined the faint traces that remained, from the first that presents itself to the last; but with little satisfaction, until I came to the words, ‘*eddichan qui fieri fecit*,’ which I read with ease, and I may indeed say with delight, as I thought I had found a key to the whole, and I knew that it had never been read, although attempted by Charles O’Conor, of Belanagare, Theophilus O’Flanagan, Ledwich, Petrie, O’Donovan, and others. Dr. Lentaigue and my son then made separate drawings of the whole, as far as they could trace it, and, having got this, we recovered the leading words, ‘*Ora pro animabus Malachie*,’ and then the name *Finola*, which clearly settled the chief part of the inscription and its proximate date. It was not until after my return this morning that I succeeded, by the assistance of my friend, Dr. John O’Donovan, in settling the Christian name of the artist, which is *Conchubhar*, and the inscription therefore reads:—

“ ‘*Ora pro animabus malachie, inollain, et chonchubhuir hī Eddichan qui fieri fecet*’ [*sic*].

“ Our next attempt was at the top line, from which, by the aid of a ladder, my son, without any assistance from me, traced the words, contracted, *manz. mur. mur.*, which will be immediately read by any Irish scholar as *Manus, Muirchertach Muirchertach*; that is, *Manus* and two *Murtoghs*. These names are placed under the three skeleton figures respectively, and very faint traces of another short word

remain, extending to the nearest of the living or clothed figures.

“The whole of the inscription is in the black letter of the close of the fourteenth century.

“There stood, until lately, an altar tomb in the niche adjoining this, further on from the great altar, with the following Irish inscription (also in black letter), which I quote from the ‘*Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many*,’ edited by Dr. O’Donovan for the Irish Archæological Society (page 105).

Do muleachlamb 6 ceallav,	For Malachy O’Kelly, for the
vo pu o maini, ocup b’ mbua-	King of O’Many (or Hy-Many),
lamb ingen i chonchuip, vo puin	and for Inbualai (Finola), the
machta o anli in leachbaig-	daughter of O’Conor, Matthew
reo.	O’Hanly made this monument.

“Over the place occupied by this tomb of O’Kelly and his wife may still be seen, distinctly enough, traces of the same kind and style of painting as that of the O’Conors, in its neighbourhood, and it is more than probable that both were put up at the same time by O’Eddichan, who seems to have been a painter, whilst O’Hanly appears to have been nothing but a mason. It would also appear, that the O’Kelly tomb, not having the universal *op vo*, &c., on it, was set up during his and his wife’s lifetime, and decorated, as well as the tomb of the O’Conors, the royal ancestors of Mrs. O’Kelly, by O’Eddichan. The erection and decorations must be very close to the year 1400, as O’Kelly was slain in 1401, and his wife died in 1403, according to the following entry in the *Annals of the Four Masters* of that year:—

“‘A. D. 1403. Fionnghuala (Finola), the daughter of Turlogh, son of Hugh O’Conor, and wife of Melaghlin O’Kelly, Lord of Hy-Many, died, after a virtuous life.’”

“How the lady descended from the three whose names are in the upper line, I have not at present time to inquire, but that she was of their line is, I think, implied in the fact of her decorating their tomb. In all the lines of the O’Conor family I can find but one set of names to agree in succession with the inscription; and they were apparently successors in the same line; here they are from the *Annals of the Four Masters*:

“‘A. D. 1293. Manus O’Conor, King of Connaught, a warlike and valiant man, the most victorious, puissant, and hospitable, of the Irish of his time, died, having been ill a quarter of a year.’

“‘A. D. 1294. Murtogh, the son of Manus O’Conor, the best *materies* of a provincial king of all his tribe, was slain by Teige (O’Conor), and Donell, the son of Teige.’

“‘A. D. 1368. Murtogh, son of Murtogh O’Conor, died.’”

The two monuments here described by Mr. Curry had been, one perfectly, the other partially, deciphered fifteen years ago by Dr. O’Donovan, then engaged in the historical department of the Irish Survey. His letter, dated 13th September, 1838, is preserved in the singularly interesting collection of letters now at Mountjoy Barracks, in the Phoenix Park. Through the kindness of Major Larcom, Dr. Todd was permitted to peruse the volume containing the letter alluded to, and has extracted the following account of the inscriptions in question:—

“I made every search for inscriptions in this Abbey, but found only four, two painted in fresco on the wall, and two inscribed on stones. On a stone inserted in the wall, at the right-hand side of a tomb, which looks like a small place for an altar, in the choir of the Abbey, is the following inscription:—

Do	Mhuleachlamb	O’Ceallaib
Do	muleachlaind	okeallaib

Do	Ri	O’Mani	agur	b’mbhualamb
do	ri	omaní	agas	dindbua

	inſen	1-chonchúip	do ríne
laínd	ingē	ichonchúit	do ríne
Macha	O'Cogun	m leabaig	pea
matha	ocogu	in leabaig	sea

“ ‘ For Muleachlaind O'Keallaid, for the King of Hy-Mani, and for Finola, the daughter of O'Conchuir, Mathew O'Cogū made this bed.’

“ The two inscriptions in fresco on the wallare so obliterated that I could not make sense of them. The wall is damp and very much stained, and there is a black scum raised on it by the dropping down of the rain. Mr. Petrie has copied the figures on this wall ; perhaps he has also attempted to decipher the inscriptions at their feet. If the wall were carefully washed on a summer's day, and then permitted to dry, a person skilled in inscriptions of the age to which these belong, could certainly read a great part of these inscriptions, but without washing the wall it would be impossible to make any sense of them.

“ I cleaned a part of the wall, and deciphered a part of the inscription under the hostage pierced with arrows.

pro āiā Malachie

Caḥ p āiā Malachíe

I think it refers to Malachy O'Kelly, for whom the other monument was inscribed. Has Mr. Petrie deciphered this inscription ?

“ I cannot forget O'Brien's notice of the figures on this wall. He makes the building a ruin of a pagan temple repaired into a monastery in the twelfth century by Charles the Redhanded, King of Connaught, and the archers represent the *longé jaculans Apollo* !”

Having quoted this account of the inscriptions from Dr. O'Donovan's letter, Dr. Todd proceeded to speak, first, of that on the tomb of Muleachlaind O'Kelly, and his wife Finola. It appeared that Dr. O'Donovan, in his Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many, gave a different reading of the inscription from

that which he had previously made out from the stone itself in his letter to the heads of the Ordnance Survey. In the former he reads o anlı as the name of the artist; in the latter, ocoğū, or *O'Cogan*; in the former he reads leachdaig pea, *this stone*; in the latter, leabaig pea, *this tomb* or *sepulchre*.

Fortunately, the stone itself had been sent up to the Exhibition, and Dr. Todd was enabled to present to the Academy an accurate rubbing of it, made by Mr. Joseph Huband Smith. From this it appears that, as far as the name of the artist is concerned, both readings are wrong, and that the name is really *O'Cogli*, or *O'Cogley*. It is evident, also, that the three concluding words of the inscription are not, *in leachdaig sea*; but, *in leabaig sea*, and that Dr. O'Donovan had deciphered them correctly in his letter just quoted, although, in his work on the Tribes and Customs of Hy-Many, he adopts the erroneous reading, *in leachdaig sea*.

It may be mentioned incidentally that this unquestionable instance of the use of the word leabaig (*lit.* a bed), to signify a tomb, or monumental gravestone, is interesting in reference to another antiquarian controversy. It is known to many of the Academy that this word leabaig, or the synonymous lige, is the name given by the peasantry in every part of Ireland to the monuments which have been called *Druids' altars*, proving evidently they were regarded in our national tradition, not as altars, but as tombs, and thus confirming the opinion so ably maintained before this Academy by Dr. Petrie (in a Paper which, it is to be regretted, has never been published),—an opinion which is now adopted generally by English and European antiquarians, although some of our learned brethren in Wales still cling to the altar hypothesis.

The Muleachlaind or Maelseachlainn O'Kelly, mentioned in the inscription, was the twenty-ninth in descent from his great ancestor Maine Mor, and became what was called king or chief of Hy-Many, in 1375. He married, first the daughter of Walter Burke, by whom he had three sons, Rory, Brian, and Conor; and, after her death, Fianguala, or Finola,

daughter of Turlogh O'Connor, by whom he had seven sons. The inscription, now before the Academy, seems to settle the question raised by O'Farrell in his *Linea Antiqua*, as to whether Finola, or the daughter of Walter Bourke, was his first wife. And it is confirmed by the testimony of the Book of Lecan, and by the fact recorded by the Four Masters, that Finola survived her husband two years, Melachlin having died in 1401, and Finola in 1403.*

These dates, as Mr. Curry has observed, fix the date of the inscription, as well as of the fresco painting; and this conclusion is fully established by the form of the characters in which the inscriptions on both monuments are written; they are manifestly the black-letter characters of the end of the fourteenth and beginning of the fifteenth century.

It is a singular proof of the ignorance or carelessness of the antiquaries of the last century that Ledwich should have ascribed this inscription to the thirteenth, and that on the fresco painting to the seventeenth century, although they are manifestly in characters of the same date. One may indeed fairly doubt whether he had ever seen either inscription, although he did not scruple to dogmatize as to their date. With respect to the inscription on the fresco, he makes no attempt to read it, either in the text of his work or in the very inaccurate engraving which he gives of the whole painting, where, though he marks the position of the inscription, he evidently represents it as illegible.

But Mr. Curry infers from the omission of the usual form: "PRAY for Mealachlain, &c.," at the beginning of the inscription, and from its being only said that the stone was erected to, or to the honour of, the chieftain and his wife, that they were living when it was put up. Of the erection of monumental inscriptions, during the life of the parties mentioned in them, there are many examples; and, in the present in-

* O'Donovan's *Hy-Many*, p. 107.

stance, it is rendered the more probable that such was the case from the space left at the end of the inscription, apparently for the insertion of the date of their deaths. If this conjecture be correct, it will follow that the monument must be older than the year 1401, and the troubled state of the country at that period will sufficiently account for the fact that the inscription after the death of the parties to whom it relates was never completed.

Dr. Todd next directed the attention of the Academy to the fresco painting, where the principal inscription, imperfectly read by Dr. O'Donovan in 1838, but now completely restored by Mr. Curry, asks the reader to pray for the souls of Malachy, of Finola, and of Conor O'Eddichan, who caused the monumental fresco to be made. The last word is somewhat doubtful; it may be either *fecit*, in which case Connor O'Eddichan would appear to have been the artist, or a contraction for *fecerunt*, in which case we must infer that Malachy, Finola, and O'Eddichan united in getting the fresco executed. The former is probably the true reading.

The fac-simile of the fresco which had been executed for the Committee of the Great Exhibition was hung up upon the wall of the meeting-room of the Academy, and Dr. Todd proceeded to make the following remarks upon it:—

There can be very little doubt that the Finola mentioned in it was the same Finola ni Conchubhair, who was married to the O'Kelly, and whose name occurs in the former inscription; and Malachias is beyond all question the Latinized form of her husband's name, Maelseachlain. If so, this painting was executed after their deaths, as it begins, *Ora pro animabus*, and Conor O'Eddichan was probably the artist; it must, therefore, be dated in 1403, or soon after. The stone was probably placed on the spot where they were actually married, and the fresco painting on the nearest wall that was found large enough for the purpose.

The fresco is divided into two subjects. On the upper

part of the wall is the first subject, representing three crowned skeletons, and three crowned figures draped, of whom two bear hawks in their hands, and the third holds a naked sword. On the lower part, to the left, is a figure of the Almighty, represented, as was then usual, in the form of an aged man, with flowing beard; on his breast a dove and large-sized crucifixion; of this, however, slight traces only now remain; the dove and crucifixion have been destroyed, probably by the Cromwellians or Puritans, to whom this mode of representing the Deity was peculiarly offensive. The plaster has in fact been entirely removed from the centre of the figure; and hence some have supposed that it represented not the Almighty, but a Brehon, holding in his left hand a book. What was taken for a book, however, is probably the remains of the left arm of the cross, and Dr. Todd was of opinion that the former is by far the more natural interpretation of the picture. On the right hand of this figure is an angel holding the balance of judgment, and on his left are two archers shooting at a naked figure, who stands between them, tied to a tree, and in whose body several other arrows are sticking, an evident representation of the martyrdom of St. Sebastian.

It has been objected that St. Sebastian does not appear to have been known in Ireland, as his name does not occur in the martyrology of the Four Masters, which was compiled by those eminent scholars from all the then extant sources of Irish Hagiology. And hence it is inferred that the execution represented in the fresco is not what it would appear at first sight to be, but an event of Irish history, the death, namely, of the hostages of Dermot Mac Murchadha, who were executed on the bridge of Athlone by Rory O'Connor, King of Ireland, A. D. 1170. To this conjecture, however, which was first suggested by Ledwich, and has been lately adopted by a much higher authority, there are serious objections. In the first

place there seems no reason why, in 1403, an event of such ancient date should be represented in a religious picture at the tomb of Malachy O'Kelly and his wife, individuals who had no other connexion with the event than that the O'Conor, who presided over the execution, was one of her remote ancestors. But secondly, the Four Masters tell us that there were three victims put to death on this occasion, namely, Diarmaid, the son of Mac Murrough, heir apparent to the throne of Leinster, his grandson, the son of Donnell Cavanagh, and the son of his foster-brother, O'Caellighe. The picture, however, represents only a single victim, and therefore accords more nearly with the martyrdom of St. Sebastian than with the death of Mac Murrough's hostages; the figure, moreover, being a naked one, according to the usual representation of St. Sebastian, without any symbol of rank, or other token, which would most probably have been added if the son of Mac Murrough had been intended. Moreover, the fresco, as the inscription shows, was evidently a monumental picture, painted on the walls of a church, in the very chancel, and consequently with a religious and devotional object; it is much more likely, therefore, that it should depict the martyrdom of a saint than a barbarous execution, more than two centuries old, with which neither the individuals whose tomb it decorated, nor the clergy of the abbey, had any special reference. Nor is it the fact that St. Sebastian's story was unknown to the ancient Church of Ireland; for although the name of that saint does not occur in the martyrology of the Four Masters, which is exclusively confined to Irish saints, yet it does occur under the form *Sapaist*, in the older martyrology of Aengus, at the 20th day of January, the very same day on which his memory is celebrated at Rome. We find his name also in the martyrology of Bede, and in all the Calendars of the English and Anglo-Irish Churches, long before the times of Maelseachlain O'Kelly and his wife Finola. See, for ex-

ample, the Calendar prefixed to the Book of Obits of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, published by the Archæological Society from a MS. of the thirteenth century.

It remains now to notice the words which appear under the three skeleton kings, in the upper part of the picture, which Mr. Curry reads, *manꝫ. mur. mur.*, and interprets them as contractions of the names *Manus*, *Muirchertach*, *Muirchertach*.

If we regard them as the names of three departed kings of Connaught, of the O'Connor dynasty, it is not easy to fix exactly the persons who are intended. The Four Masters, in 1293, record the death of Manus O'Connor, king of Connaught, an event which was the beginning of a long series of fatal conflicts. His son was named Muirchertach, and this would lead us at first sight to think that we had found two at least of the skeleton kings of the painting. But we are at a loss for a second of the name; and even this Muirchertach does not appear to have ever succeeded to his father's kingdom, for his murder, by Teige O'Connor and his son Dermot, is recorded in the annals at the very next year, 1294. Still, however, he may have been represented by one of the skeletons of the fresco, inasmuch as he was the lawful heir of his father, *adhered* *coicebdarꝫ do bpeapp da ðneð*, as he is called by the Four Masters.

His second son was named Manus, and was killed in 1315, where he is called by the Four Masters the most famous and illustrious of the princes of Connaught; so that if the names on the fresco were Manus, Murtogh, and Manus, there would be a high probability that the three skeleton kings represented the extinct line of Manus O'Connor and his two sons, who, although kept from their rights by the superior power of their rival, were nevertheless, *de jure*, the heirs to their father, and were doubtless regarded by many as the legitimate chieftain. It is therefore a question worth inquiring into, whether Mr. Curry has correctly deciphered this

part of the inscription, and whether the names are not really *man?*, *mur. man?*. The great injuries which the painting has received render it not impossible, notwithstanding Mr. Curry's usual accuracy, that he may have mistaken the latter word, especially as it appears from his letter that this part of the inscription was read for him by the less experienced eye of his son.

On the death of Manus, we are told by the annalists that Aodh, son of Eogan O'Connor, was made king by the influence of the English Lord Justice or Viceroy, and was maintained in his place by the English interest for many years, and amidst various contests and vicissitudes. At one time he was taken prisoner by Fitzgerald, and Cathal Roe O'Connor took the kingdom; but three months afterwards Cathal was murdered by a near relative, and Aodh returned to power. In 1296, however, we find that Aodh, who had hitherto relied on English support, was deposed by his own tribe, and the Clan Murtough brought in to fill the throne in his place, in the person of Conor Roe, son of Cathal O'Connor. If the correct reading of the inscription, therefore, be *Manus*, *Muirchertach*, *Muirchertach*, as Mr. Curry gives it, it is not impossible that the second *Muirchertach* may be intended to stand for this new dynasty of the Clan Murtough, which derived its name from Muirheartach Muimhneach O'Connor, who died in 1210, and was the son of the celebrated Turlogh Mor O'Connor, King of Ireland from A. D. 1106 to 1156. The Clan Murtough, however, continued but a short time in power: their necessities probably led them to pillage the churches and to seize upon the property of the laity. They lost their popularity, and Aodh was restored by the aid of the English and of the Burkes,—“God, the Virgin Mary, and Columbkille,” say the Four Masters, “having taken vengeance on the Clan Murtough for despoiling their churches:” and thus Aodh continued in power, and this time apparently with the consent of his tribe,

being still supported by the English, until 1309, when he was slain by Aodh Breifneach, the representative and head of his rivals of the Clan Murtough, who the very next year was, in his turn, treacherously murdered, and the line of Aodh returned to power in the person of his son Feidlimidh.

All this, however, was the history of the century previous to the times of Mealseachlain O'Kelly and his wife Finola, and there does not appear any sufficient reason why this particular series of events should have been represented in the fresco, except that Finola appears to have been the granddaughter of Aodh, son of Eoghan O'Conor, whose history has just been given. And this seems to suggest another reason against the supposition that the execution of Mac Murrough's son and hostage is the event portrayed in the fresco; for Aodh, son of Eoghan, grandfather of Finola, had been raised to the throne, and maintained there, in opposition to the power of the Clan Murtough, by the interest of the English. It is not probable, therefore, that the barbarous murder of Mac Murrough's son, which marked such extreme hostility to the English on the part of the O'Conors, should have been the one event of Irish history selected for the decoration of her tomb. She too, and probably her husband, was more likely, like the rest of her family, to have been in the interest of the English.

It must be admitted, however, that we have no sufficient explanation of the three draped and crowned figures in the upper part of the picture. That on the left, it should be observed, is bearded, and evidently represents a personage older than the other two, who are of youthful appearance, especially the figure bearing the naked sword on the extreme right. It is possible, however, that these may represent the line of kings in actual possession; but why they are limited to three does not very clearly appear. It may be stated as a conjecture, which Dr. Todd stated that he threw out merely as a subject for further investigation, that there seem to have been three kings

of the race to which Finola belonged, as well as three of the extinct race of Manus. If so, the draped figures will represent the three royal ancestors of the wife of O'Kelly: viz., Aedh, son of Eoghan, her grandfather, who was slain in 1309; Feidlimidh, his son, who reigned six years, and was slain in the great battle of Athenry in 1316, at the early age of 23; when his rival Ruaidhri or Rory na bfeadh (or of the Faes, a territory near Athlone, where he was fostered), one of the Clan Murtogh, took the throne and held it until he was murdered by Cathal, the son of Aodh, in 1321, who then succeeded his brother, and is probably the third of the draped sovereigns; for in 1324 we find another Cathal, of the Clan Murtogh family, styled King of Connaught by the annalists.

The conjecture, therefore, which Dr. Todd threw out as to the meaning of the figures is, that the three skeleton kings represent the extinct race of Manus O'Conor, who died in 1293, and that the draped and living kings represent the three regal ancestors of Finola: viz., Aodh or Hugh, son of Eoghan, who succeeded in 1293; Feidhlimidh, his son, who succeeded in 1310; and Cathal, another son, who appears to have succeeded in 1321.

It is to be understood, however, that this is a mere conjecture, intended to attract the attention of Irish scholars to the subject, in the hope that the investigation of it may lead to the fuller elucidation of a very obscure period in our history. It may be observed, that the Irish names under the skeleton figures forbid us to suppose the upper part of the picture to have any relation to the martyrdom of St. Sebastian, and fully justify us in assuming that this portion of the fresco has relation to Irish or family history.